



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,469	11/26/2003	John P. Karidis	ARC920030084US1	7647

7590  
Frederick W. Gibb, III  
McGinn & Gibb, PLLC  
Suite 304  
2568-A Riva Road  
Annapolis, MD 21401

08/17/2007

EXAMINER
----------

GEBRESILASSIE, KIBROM K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2128

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/17/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/723,469

Applicant(s)

KARIDIS ET AL.

Examiner

Kibrom K. Gebresilassie

Art Unit

2128

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 03 August 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-22.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

See Continuation.

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
FRED FERRIS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

***Advisory Action***

1. This communication is responsive to After Final rejection filed on 08/03/2007.
2. Claims 1-22 are pending.

***Response to Arguments***

3. Response to 102 rejection: Applicant's arguments filed 08/03/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- a. Applicant's argued:

Applicants traverse the rejections because there is a fundamental difference between the claimed invention and Kushler. In Kushler, the text is input via *continuously* sliding a finger or pen over a "touch-sensitive screen". To the contrary, the claimed invention inputs text by tapping individual keys on a keyboard, counting the number of keystroke landing points, and determining the word based on the number of keystroke landing points.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., **inputs text by tapping individual keys on a keyboard and/or determining the word based on the number of keystroke landing points**) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

Art Unit: 2128

See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

For the sake of argument, the reference teaches:

[0006] Analogous to one-finger typing, the current state-of-the art for inputting using a virtual keyboard is called "point and tap". A stylus is moved from letter to letter and pressed down on the desired key to select it. This results in the need to always lift and set down the stylus, slowing input. Cursive handwriting was invented to allow a better (and faster) flow from letter to letter and reduce the number of pen (or quill) lifts. In a similar way, the current invention reduces the number of taps required when inputting using an on-screen keyboard, thus speeding text entry.

[0010] There are two large shortcomings of on-screen keyboards: first they take up valuable screen space on the computer needed for whatever task is requiring text input. Second, and more importantly, they are slow because the user is forced to tap one letter at a time—effectively reducing the user to input text in a way that is analogous to single finger typing on a regular physical keyboard.

Therefore, the limitation of "inputting texts by tapping individual keys on a keyboard" is a prior art as seen in the above paragraphs of the reference.

Further, the reference teaches:

[0027] The present invention provides a keyboard text entry system for devices with touch-sensitive input panels or touch-sensitive display screens. More specifically, the present invention provides a system and method that enables the user to enter text word-by-word using a keyboard displayed or printed on a touch-sensitive screen, wherein contact with the surface of the display generates input signals to the system corresponding to the location of

, which is clearly shows the reference teaches "inputting" texts by tapping individual keys on a keyboard as claimed invention.

The reference also teaches the limitation of “determining the word based on the number of keystroke landing points” using the “**input pattern analysis**” as follows:

[0040] After the input pattern analysis component identifies the inflection points associated with an input pattern, the pattern matching component examines the words stored in the system database to determine which words are the most likely matching candidates. While the aspect described herein is a simple and computationally efficient method to identify which words of a database best match an input pattern, it is to be understood that other alternative approaches could achieve this goal, and should not be considered to be outside the scope of the present invention.

[0048] The problem of identifying the optimal matching between the M letters of a candidate word and the N identified inflection points and input pattern path segments is a variant of the “shortest path” problem which is well known in the field of dynamic programming. Various algorithms, such as the Floyd-Warshall algorithm, have been designed to solve the problem of finding the shortest path that traverses an edge-weighted graph from a designated start vertex to a designated end vertex. This classic problem is analogous in certain ways to the problem of identifying an optimal matching between the inflection points and intervening path segments of an input pattern and the locations of the keys associated with the letters of a potentially matching candidate word. Such algorithms are relatively

In addition, the reference teaches:

[0029] The path traced out on the touch-screen by the user and recorded by the system for analysis is referred to as the input pattern. As the user traces out an input pattern on the touch-screen, the system records the sequence of points of contact detected by the touch-screen controller hardware. As the input pattern is recorded, it is processed by an input pattern analysis component. The input pattern analysis com-

“...records the sequence of points of contact...” is analogous to “counting” the number of keystroke landing points as claimed invention.

b. Applicant's argued:

addition, it is Applicants' position that the prior art of record fails to teach the claimed features of "recording a coordinate of at least one keystroke landing point, wherein said keystroke landing point emanates from tapping a key on a keyboard; [and] counting a total amount of tapped keystroke landing points" as defined by independent claim 8 and "a recorder configured to record a coordinate of a keystroke landing point corresponding to a sequence of tapped keys on said computer keyboard; [and] a counter configured to count a total number of keystroke landing points tapped" as defined by independent claim 15.

In response, applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

4. Examiner finds applicant's argument unpersuasive and therefore the rejection is maintained.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kibrom K. Gebresilassie whose telephone number is 571-272-8571. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 4:30 pm Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamini Shah can be reached on 571-272-2279. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KG